

**Actual Comments Received at Workshop No. 1 held on Sept. 20, 2001**

The main purpose of this workshop was to list the issues (get them out and on the table) that workshop participants thought should be considered by the eleven cities and districts (parties) that are negotiating a new water supply agreement. This list was compiled from brainstorming sessions held by groups of about 20 persons each and from written comments (3x5 cards) turned in by workshop participants. The following 5 questions were posed to all participants. Comments received on each question follow that question

**Question 1. What project implementation and financial practices have been effective under the existing agreement? What issues need to be addresses in the new agreement?**

Projects must include ground water storage and monthly caps and rates adjusted

Currently a huge surface water project is left in secret costs, must be public

System for financial communication between the agency and the contractors; provision for additional storage facilities and fresh water should be in new agreement

More emphasis on water budget; closer concentration on ground water infiltration vs. extraction; closer awareness of exported water; exploration of water outside watershed

Is funding available in New Agreement for adequate watershed protection or restoration? Upslope acquisition?

Financing mechanisms to pay for facilities authorized by Amendment 11

No local general plans have time horizon beyond 2020, what is demand projection for 2037?

In cost allocation iniquity between existing and new customers, costs are spread primarily among existing customers; new customers are getting a free ride

Operation and maintenance have been operating

Water tastes terrible- smells too (chlorine)

There should be equity and fair share in cost distribution

Cost allocation system is based on cause i.e. whoever creates need...pays for it

Projection and water consumption for land uses throughout North Bay

True tiered water rates to reflect the actual costs of water delivery

Bonds

Limit growth to water resource availability?

What is a “water shortage”?

What about desalinization?

Agency projects with contractors?

Supply and cost associated when drawing up contractor GPs?

Long-term degradation to recharge areas from GPs?

Insufficient background to comment

Water agency’s competency (staff)

Requires a lot of knowledge

Appreciation for water availability (now)

Resistance/reluctance of Water Agency to share data with elected officials

Does 2-year debt payoff include Lake Sonoma?

Implementation – differentiation between peak and minimal demand economic –life cycle cost analysis, avoided costs, marginal costs, clear difference- fixed and variable

Would like to see models and case studies from other cities and communities

Cost of building an infiltration plant

Cost of water is too low, not encouraging conservation

Cumulative impacts of increasing water supply in entire region

What happens to excess water allocations?

Incentives for conservation or tiered rates

Tiered rates for water suppliers as well

General obligation bonds instead of pay as you go- referring to new facilities

Define better how recycling the water will work

Cost to the environment for taking the water? Cost analysis wanted.

Is industrial cost the same as residential?

What are the benefits to the environment for using less water? Cost analysis should include by the watershed

Opposed to population growth and continued supply

Concern with increased draw on river.

Marin should continue to pay more since water is a Sonoma County asset

More emphasis on requirements i.e.: storage for parties to agreement

Agreement should support (include time lines) and commitment to build storage

Concern over flow diversions. Practices have been destroying fisheries

Address current need exceeds safe supply 'Do we need more capacity?'

'How can we talk about more capacity?'

County coordinate with state's water rights

Conserved water should not be used to fuel growth

Public participation in use of saved water

Improve public info system

Economic comparison between gravel mining and its economic benefit to ratepayers and the costs of a filtrating system.

Improved and diversified governance

Live within the limitations of natural resources and not go to outside watersheds

Include non-contractors at the table (i.e. Sebastopol, Occidental, coast) since they will be cumulatively impacted by the increasing growth around them.

I would like to see the new growth that increases the costs of our water supply have that new cost reflected in their water pricing, i.e. house #1 pays basic rate, new house #2 pays at basic rate plus a premium to help pay for new projects that are necessary to provide water for new growth.

I would like to see the SCWA be run by a board other than the Board of Supervisors- this places too much power in the hands of 5 people.

Recycled water is the key to most of the environmental and financial issues of waters conservation- expand recycle programs.

New growth should pay for increased capacity protection.

Purchasing of watershed lands.

Good: proportionate cost allocations to contractors

Need: more debt financing for capital projects

Financial cost of disposal of waste should be included in this agreement

Financial conservation: the use of spring lake as a municipal water supply brings us to the law pertaining to water quality such as the CA Safe Drinking Water Act, and rightfully so. As a result, we are looking at a one billion dollar filtration plant. See a problem here?

Stop expanding system based on peak demand- reduce peak demand instead.

Financial practices should be added, repair of erosion on Russian River and its tributaries, purchase and protection of watershed, increased capacity should be paid for by new users and builders and upgrade and maintenance paid by all.

Include regional review of city general plans cumulative impacts when assessing water demands. The demands of one city impacts the supply of water to the other cities.

**Question 2. What water conservation and recycling practices have been effective under the current agreement? What issues need to be addressed in the new agreement?**

Make temporary conservation measures in MOU part of permanent agreement

Benefit from analytical framework to consistently rank cost effectiveness of competing conservation alt.

Upgrading of wastewater treatment plants to supply aquifer recharge

Contractors upgrade rewards for water users who conserve greatly – scale system for water conservation

Increase support for reuse and use of gray water

Increase infiltration of wastewater via irrigation of redwoods

Incentive for contractors to bank unused water for future benefit

Maximize water re-use

Financial incentives for conservation

Tiered rate structure to encourage conservation lifeline rate more reasonable

Allowing banking for future use of conserved water

Landscape standards for conservation consistent throughout commercial and residential

Real time feedback on limited area or needs

Water reuse is as important as conservation

Way to identify lost water

Use north Santa Rosa waste water system as model

More flexibility in Title 22 Standards concerning reuse

Stronger role in quality standards for reuse

Redistribute water to provide or recharge watersheds

Scavenge waste water from sewage trunk lines to irrigate landscaping- extend trunk lines to central and south counties

Reward innovation with financial incentives/penalties for excessive use

Mandate use of recycled water to irrigate landscape

Use recycled water to recharge groundwater (county wide ordinance to encourage recycled water use)

Drought preparation (including financial)

Public education and involvement

Conservation info and web not available

Not enough funding

Water reuse is good for future

Conservation doesn't enhance quality of life due to growth

No water reclaim goals by Agency

Water Agency specialists are helping effectively with conservation and funding

Equity in funding distribution of conservation funds

How much above ground vs. below (recycled?)

Fund for watershed restoration

Conservation devices avail. Countywide

What happens to conserved water?

Recycling and efficiency analyzed separately

Why not more than 6600 acre-ft conservation goal per year?

Equal funding for recycling, expansion and efficiency

What good is conservation if new development takes all saved capacity?

How does the conserved amounts compare to new development?

Reward those who reach the goal before 2010 with rebated/cheaper rates

Will vineyards continue to grow even though they are 1 of 3 biggest users of water?

Help vineyards (other contractors) what programs will help them?

Local Agency policy changes to discourage high water use in landscaping and encourage Xeriscape

Cash for grass program

Listing of “other contractors” users and how much they are consuming and their rates?

The current recycled water program has been effective in the past with regard to how water is delivered and when is customer notified of shutoff?

Higher quality recycled water. Have doubts about the health hazards.

What penalty should be assessed and who can assess it? Does it happen that violators get penalized? It should happen.

Tiered water rate gives priority to those who conserve

Concern about water we are saving being sold to new development

Getting parties to same level of water conservation

Coordination of efforts on public outreach

Commitment to centralized information center for public

Fairness in the amount of water availability to each jurisdiction for growth

Find ways to effectively recycle water so that more is available- that it is clean or is only used for construction or landscaping.

Let all residents know what conservation programs are available- not just homeowners and property owners.

More effective publicity on water conservation to renters, and not just homeowners, for example.

Develop incentives and disincentives for water conservation.

Encourage reuse of water in urban area by encouraging “gray water” irrigation. Encourage aquifer recharge through increased use of permeable concrete

We already have too much population using too much water. Eel River is injured by current

diversion, Russian River impaired for anadromous fish. Energetic conservation and recycling are important, but if the population is allowed to just keep increasing, water use and environmental damage will increase. This agreement is thinking “in box”; larger view is needed but current Board of Supervisors majority is pro development and anti-environment, situation untenable unless (there are) radical changes of growth and development policy.

Have all the contractors received conservation money from the SCWA? Is it equitably apportioned?

Tiered rate structure so that the biggest users pay the most. Support residential systems for runoff collection and gray water irrigation for landscaping; treat water as finite commodity rather than unlimited resource.

Provision for extensive agricultural use of recycled water.

Require toilet replacement at time of sale of property

Stop supplying new customers through an impaired deliver system; use less, pay more, build more?

Local Agency policy changes to discourage too high water use landscaping.

**Question 3. What environmental practices have been effective under the current agreement? What issues need to be addressed in the new agreement?**

Overall watershed management for portable water supply FOREVER i.e.: New York City, gravel logging, wastewater discharge to river, and damage to Eel river watershed.

Streams managed as streams rather than flood control

Water supply budget focusing on stream habitat; first with water supply and secondly determining urban use from particular streams

How does Eel River play into water issues?

Gravel mining impacts must be addressed, even eliminated

Environmental impacts to Eel - direct transfer of wealth from Mendocino, Humboldt, Lake to Marin and Sonoma

Transportation impacts within watershed must be analyzed. Good program in Humboldt and Del Norte.

Runoff from highways and roads paved/unpaved controlled. NO NEW ROADS without Pacific Fishery Associate Road Management Practices Handbook

Don't allow discharge from Geyser Pipeline into River above Healdsburg

Emphasis on Habitat Restoration including management of non-native species

Take a look at agriculture practices and how they affect the river

True impact of summer dams on fisheries

Stop blaming NMFS and fish for filtration plants

Reduce/eliminate pharmaceutical/hormonal and other chemical inflows

Change mission to encompass water supply forever

Treat river as a finite resource

Expansion of water consumption affects wastewater volume

Use of water affects quality of wastewater

Growth inducing aspects of water supply expansion

Clean up Russian River water as an environmental practice

Purchase and protection of watershed lands

Appropriateness of Board of Supervisors as water agency directors

Relationship of water agreement with So. Co. General Plan update and other contractors

Consider putting flood control channels under agreement

Use detention ponds for ground water recharge

Measure groundwater depletion and method of replacement

Plan for the unknown

Enforcement of practices such as wastewater release (temp.) (worked well in principle in past)

Long-term environmental effects of WAC (e.g. Fisheries need for cold water). Increment and interactive affect

Needed high water flow for pumps affects on fish in rivers

Concerns about forced high flows need on Russian River

Build filter plant on Lake Sonoma (removing river from the equation)

Do EIR on groundwater recharge on entire Russian River watershed (including reclaimed wastewater)

Fast track groundwater assessment study for use with current General Plan

Water study should not be limited to area, should extend to all water basins within the county and recharge areas



Other wildlife concerns with regard to watershed

Impact of additional water draw for Lake Sonoma

More info regarding offshore fisheries

Conflict in Board of Supervisors with regard to Agency Management and County development

Declining quality of watershed, measures to be taken

Comprehensive Watershed plan (State mandated)

\$500 million filtration plant

Distinguishing between watershed impacts by agency and others

Gravel mining concerns and impacts on filtration

Restoration of wetlands

Growth inducing impacts of increasing water supply

Impact on Eel River and diversions

Percent of total flow of Eel that is diverted?

Agency budget should not be dependent on water sales

What are the carrying capacity issues? Stop total withdrawals and begin to reduce

An adjustment process for Russian River

Discussion and evaluation of issues beyond regulatory constraints. Start early.

Carrying capacity of all water needs for the watershed. Need for River management plan

Accurate information for water supply includes Lake Pillsbury, because those conditions drive the amount of water in the Russian River and impacts to the Eel system

Stop gravel mining on the Russian River

Full environmental to change summer limit on Russian River

Change the allowed limit for Santa Rosa, measure the cities wastewater discharge, measure in the laguna not at Hacienda

What is happening to groundwater levels and how replenished?

What studies are done to show the effects of building in flood plains?

Impacts of vineyards on water supply

Regional approach to Russian River watershed management

How do artificial flow regimes affect wildlife, fish, riparian and the environmental situation?

Economic comparison of river gravel mining to county – how much does it contribute to the local economy vs. how much it would cost to build an infiltration system

Explore using bio-diesel fuel instead of diesel fuel for all water agency diesel engines

What happens if ESA forces the rubber dam to close and stop/reduce releases into the dry creek?

City- county council plans need to be tied into new agreement

Growth is going beyond the water resource.

Address ‘Gravel Mining’

Address some way to stabilize the threatened and endangered species and fish

Coordination of all conservation efforts among all agencies

No new effective environmental practices

Biological opinions should drive decisions re. water resources

City and county should live within watershed resources

Flooding should be considered in use of water resources

Water consumption is already exceeding ecosystem capacity

Reward these industries (vineyards) that use sound environmental practices or penalize bad practices

Enhance flood control—develop more natural flood control techniques, also stream bank enhancements

Increase money available for environmental protection

Address effect of gravel mining and vineyard development on flooding the Russian River and in Petaluma

Filtration system being destroyed by gravel mining

Is water supply agreement being developed in a manner that is responsive to the regions carrying capacity?

What safeguards are in place to ensure that conservation does not result in more growth?

What provisions are, or will be in place to minimize water supply shortages during drought years?

Like to see: Expansion of restoration projects using recycled water as at Kelly Farm in Santa Rosa, no more golf courses, encourage use of native CA plants, discourage grass lawns while encouraging wildlife habitat gardening wherever and whenever possible, and limit growth to real water capacity and supply in order to expand growth!

As the supply of water would be increased in the county, what would the impacts be to inducing growth in the region? For example, as the supply of water would be increased, there would be pressure for additional growth. How would the impacts of this new growth be addressed? Additional traffic congestion would be one of those impacts.

**Question 4. What agreement governance practices have been effective under the current agreement? What issues need to be addressed in the new agreement?**

Unanimous approval

Upgrading of WAC as representatives of the contractors

Identify stakeholders in 5 counties; give them real role in watershed management and resource extraction

Directly elect SCWA directors

Concern of overall view of groundwater – What is available and where? –Are people using their own wells? – How does it affect the overall agreement?

GM of Agency to be more forthcoming with project what it is and isn't

Disclosure of all activities to all contractors and ratepayers including engineering and lobbying groups

Interests other than human should be lobbied; animals, fish, birds- keep whole ecosystem together. Grade for the directors on number of species diversity

Policy set by elected officials NOT engineers

Upgrade language on Potter Valley so each contractor should determine by its elected board if it wants to participate in ownership

Gravel miners pay royalty and restoration to public taxpayers

Should the Board of the water agency be directly elected by the WAC or replaced by the WAC?

Separate governance (elected officials) issues from operational (engineers) issues

Develop regional master plan for all water agency's supply and demand

A regional water plan for Eel & Russian Rivers and the use within Mendocino, Sonoma, and Marin Co

Regional water policy

Maintain governance of SCWA in Sonoma County by Sonoma officials as opposed to regional governance

Too much power is given to the Director of WAC

All people affected by activities of the WAC should have representation

Sever ties between Sonoma County Water Agency and County Board of Sups. (make SCWA elected position instead of appointed)

Listen to the needs of local communities (don't force extensive projects)

Balance local concerns with administrative actions, avoid tyranny of majority/minority (one Agency)

Ensure equity between current users needing upgrades vs. new growth projects

Separate elected board to manage water.

WAC should consist of elected officials

WAC shouldn't make policy-back to city

Increase enforcement of water rights by agency

Who polices water rights?

Availability of info for public and elected officials

Alternatives to Board of Sups as board of SCWA (ruling board for water agency should be elected)

Does WAC operate under Brown Act?

Possibility of adding non-government agent to WAC

Clear understanding of governance best practice. Models?

Governing Board to consist of at least one elected official from water contract agency and district

Regional Governance needs to represent where the water goes and where it is from

Way to align official statements from water contract agencies. How do we know they said that?

Governance should be regional by contractor

All documents handed out in workshop are inaccurate. All general public handouts should be correct

Water Agency to be more forthcoming to the WAC. WAC needs to know more about what Water Agency is doing

WAC needs to get better understanding of water agency

Master agreement needs to pin down State Water Rights re: Agreement with agricultural and urban uses of river water

Board of Supervisors is the fundamental problem

Board of Supervisors should not be SCWA Board; should be independently elected

Contract should have teeth--- Consequences---

Current structure is agreement small entity has equal power as large agency

Require minimum conservation projects

Need equitable rate of growth for different users

Concern re. status of research regarding conservation practices

Board of Supervisors should not be Board of SCWA. The Board of SCWA should be elected by the public in a general election. Could have regional representation.

I would like the governing board of the SCWA to be elected in a general election instead of being the Board of Sups.

WAC- Cities supporting one another in each cities active encouragement of growth and development to stimulate local revenues (tax dollars) vs. stimulation for environmental conservation, and other related concerns.

Elected reps in control of governance- conflict of interest possible, especially with regard to campaign contributors, district constituencies, etc.

How can we proceed with a water supply agreement when we don't know yet what our legal limitations will be? Pending NMFS, Potter Valley, RR, salmon, etc.

Shouldn't the water supply agreement be an engineered operation agreement based on the various general plans that are just getting under way?

The question was introduced by a plug for what a good job the SCWA has been doing-more manipulation of the workshop.

Is the governance steerclouse (steerclore?) in place to restore the watershed instead of building a 500 million dollar filtration?

Deciding development and water management policy represents a conflict of interest. Cities that derive revenue from developments are not the best representatives for water quality protection. Protection of Headwaters and up shore infiltration zones should be primary public trust- manage RR as long term resource.

SCWA Board of Directors should be independently elected. The B.O.S. should not be the board of the SCWA.

**Question 5. In addition to the issues discussed already this evening, are there other issues that should be addressed in the new agreement or in the vision statement?**

Sustainability legacy to future generation resource usable

Any agreement negotiated must have balanced approach between environmental and agricultural community

Budget component for R & D technology

Financial component for watershed restoration i.e. a set aside

Work cooperatively with other agencies and governments including OSD for watershed management for health

Natural flow of river mimic 25 cfs keep flow consistent; very beneficial to river and fish

Restore gravel beds for filtration and storage in river aquifer  
Prevent further use of existing gravel pits for sewage storage

Time to discuss moratorium on impaired aqueduct system

Stop asking existing customers to cut back or pay more while allowing for new customers

More extensive use of recycled water

Russian River flood control measures to be done consistently with habitat restoration

Include recreational use of water agency lands

Develop watershed management plan

Consider watershed governance and cooperation and relate it to water supply

Address pollution of Russian River by flushed down pharmaceuticals

Consider leveraging open space district funds for watershed easement and acquires flow rights and assist land stewardship

County un-incorporated areas not currently served by aqueduct- they should be (they helped pay for it)

Centralized control of wastewater and all other delivery of water is wrong, separation of power is wrong

Clear up questions over water rights, connect (encourage) recycled water usage before withdraw

of water rights

Users should have more say in what conserved water is used for

Can we bank water conserved instead of giving it to new development

Moratorium on growth in county until complete county groundwater availability assessment has been done

Consolidate and simplify current array of water agreements

Relationship between involved cities general plans and water agency expansion plans

How will agency deal with SB221?

Ground water contamination and effects

Healdsburg's sewer system vicinity to river

Resources to be managed rather than product to be sold

Go from linear model to cycling

Vastly improve and transport info system between Agency and public (website needs more info)

SCWA assumes a 2% growth rate over the next 20 years; at what point do environmental needs take precedent over growth patterns?

How can they implement plans for water development without approval of State Water

Resources Board to take 20000 acre/feet from Lake Sonoma?

Continuous improvement into equity for the future of all life

The vision statement should acknowledge all the beneficial uses of the Russian River.

SCWA states in federal hearings that any reduction of Eel River flows to the Russian River will collapse the system, yet you fail to discuss the Eel River or the impact on that system.

Continue to work with all stakeholders to develop indicators that define success of the system

Future plan will be sanctioned as noble by the Native American

How will SCWA address failing wells of unincorporated county, is there a margin or cushion?

Lowering of gravel water; SCWA should be protesting instead of selling it dry

Arc recreational uses being considered in the agreement?

A business with profit motive won't protect the environment; job is to sell no conservation incentive water

No conservation incentive

Have an independent internal department responsible for auditing environmental degradation from operating a water supply system

Need an entire Russian River watershed plan and Mendocino County watershed plan

View recycled water as a resource

Quantify damage done by gravel mining and cost of filtration plant if gravel beds are destroyed.  
What is happening to ground water levels? In wells?

How much water is being taken from the Eel River and what is the effect of the Eel River on the Russian River?

We need to use less, recycle, NOT deplete the Eel River, not deplete ground water, not build in flood plains, not cut trees on hillsides, not replace trees with grapes, not gravel mine the Russian River.

Stop all diversion of the Eel River water

Need a breakdown of water uses of grapes, other agriculture, domestic, golf courses, industry, etc.

What is being done to fix leaks?

What is being done to recycle water, use natural plant-based methods for cleaning water?

What has the impact of grape growing been on the water use in Sonoma County?

What have the impacts been of allowing building in flood plains e.g. Petaluma and Cotati?

How much natural habitat has been lost in wetlands and surrounding areas?

Why is more water needed and is it purely to fuel growth/ Why not just conserve and restrain growth instead?

It is amazing how much misinformation is commonly accepted regarding the water system.

Need to determine population holding capacity and irrigation limits for agricultural land consistent with potentially available water after stream restoration.

Legacy to future generations must include healthy resource base. Best management practices should be systematically and periodically renewed for cost effective opportunities.

### **Comments received about Workshop Process:**

Comment on this process- I feel that as a layperson I really didn't have all the facts to offer a fully informed decision. I would like to see a workshop that is just on background where relevant documents are open for review so that my opinion will be fully formed.



This process is far too structured to allow fruitful discussion.

I have a great many questions and concerns but am not clear on how to fit them into the framework, language and wording used this evening.

Comment on this process- there is too much competition sound wise in this building, it is hard to hear; maybe a better place with more favorable acoustics.

Comments on process- the language used is technical, way over the heads of the general public. We don't necessarily know the issues- it would be good to have maps and dates and information on the wall- Where does our water come from? Go to? Explain Potter Valley and Eel Rivers. Explain groundwater tables, use of wells vs. Russian River issues like gravel mining. How water is used. Why a certain growth rate is being assigned.

I went through a similar process with PRMD, a general plan update. Public wrote their own comments in their own words on a flip chart and were able to circulate and meet knowledgeable staff. This worked better.

Comment pertaining to workshop 1- Recorders should know enough about water issues and terms to more accurately summarize comments. Because there was a low turnout, the groups should have been smaller. Slides were too wordy.

I have a comment aside from the questions- the seats in this hall are instruments of torture!

My group had people in it who broke the no contradiction rule- when citizens made critical assertions about THE Agency, they were told that their assertions were incorrect. There were Agency plants in our group to defend it.

All questions: Though I have been a Water Board watcher for 11 years, the questions presumed a detailed knowledge of the contract and made me feel like a dummy. Also each question asked us first to praise the contract- I felt manipulated. So did others.

Visual presentation is hard to see.

Where can the Power Point information from the meeting be accessed?

Future public meetings will be lots of fun!